

**REMARKS**

This is in response to the Official Action currently outstanding with respect to the above-identified application.

Claims 11-13, 15, 52-60 and 62 were pending at the time of the issuance of the currently outstanding Official Action. By the foregoing Amendment, Claims 11-13, 15 and 52-60 have been amended. No further Claims have been canceled, added or withdrawn. Accordingly, upon the entry of the foregoing Amendment, Claims 11-13, 15, 52-60 and 62 will constitute the claims under active prosecution in the above-identified application.

The claims of this application as they will stand in the event that the Examiner grants the entry of the foregoing Amendment are set forth above including appropriate designations of the changes being made and also with appropriate status identifiers as required by the Rules.

More particularly, in the currently outstanding Official Action the Examiner has:

1. Re-acknowledged Applicants' claim for foreign priority under 35 USC §119 (a)-(d) or (f) and the receipt by the United States Patent and trademark Office of the required certified copies of the priority documents.
2. Reconfirmed that the formal drawings filed in this case on 21 October 2003 have been accepted.

3. Withdrawn the previous rejection of Claims 11, 13, 15, 52, 54 and 58-60 under 35 USC 112, first paragraph.
4. Rejected claims 11-13, 15, 52-60 and 62 (all of the pending claims of this application) under 35USC 102(e) as being anticipated under 35 USC 102(e) by Walker (US Patent No. 6,279,017 B1).

Further comment regarding items 1-3 above is not deemed to be required in these Remarks.

With respect to item 4 above, Applicants have noted the in the Response to Arguments section of the currently outstanding Official Action, the Examiner has emphasized Applicants' use of the terminology "...complexity of a character or **characters** or the complexity of a particular image being displayed" as well as the terminology "...frequency of a character or **characters** or the frequency of a particular image being displayed". In particular, the Examiner has asserted that the Walker reference discloses at col. 10, lines 50-53; a "complex special event"; that he specifically characterizes as a combination of multiple characters such as the English alphabets makes up words, that longer words require longer emphasis; words that are longer contain more geometric shapes and therefore is more geometric complex than a word that is shorter. The Examiner also makes a similar comment concerning the frequency of a character or **characters** or the frequency of particular image data being displayed. Hence, the Examiner has indicated that Walker discloses that a word frequency dictionary is used to weight the difficulty of a word (col. 39, lines 50-53) wherein a combination of multiple characters such as the English alphabets makes up words and further that Walker discloses that longer visual emphasis is required for more difficult words (col. 10, lines 50-53). Furthermore, the Examiner has confirmed that Applicant has described the fundamental differences between Kanji characters the the Japanese language and the English language alphabets, but indicated a belief that those differences are not found in the claims.

Applicants understand the Examiner's comments in response to their last Amendment to be a favorable suggestion that the Examiner might be willing to withdraw the currently outstanding rejections **provided that** Applicants are willing to limit the wording of the claims to "a character" (singular) as being beyond the scope of the definition of a "complex event" in the Walker reference. In other words, even though a single English language character can be a word as Walker has defined the same, the Walker "complex event" must be made up of more than a single character thereby avoiding at least the currently outstanding anticipation rejection. In view of this understanding, Applicants by the foregoing Amendment have limited the scope of all of the claims of this application to the complexity and/or frequency of "a character" rather than "a character or characters" or a particular image being displayed. Applicants respectfully submit that as so amended the claims of this application now are in condition for allowance for essentially the same reasons as have been presented heretofore in this prosecution. For the sake of the completeness of the record, those arguments are repeated below for emphasis and for the convenience of the Examiner.

The Walker reference discloses at column 10, lines 50-53, the staggering in time of the color or brightness of individual phases, words, etc. Specifically, the Walker disclosure emphasizes "longer, more difficult words requiring longer to pronounce" as a basis of his color or brightness display control. It is to be noted, however, that the Walker reference does not teach, disclose or suggest that his display control is to be based upon the complexity of the individual characters displayed. Further, Applicants respectfully submit that the fact that a particular grouping of highlighted words may take longer to pronounce has no impact relative to the frequency with which the various letters (characters) appear in the document.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully note that the present application specifically discloses, and now specifically claims, that the remark control means operates based upon the **complexity of a character being displayed**. In this regard, Applicants respectfully submit that it should be clearly understood that the complexity of a character is a quite different concept from the complexity of a word or group of words made up of individual characters.

For example, the English language character “I” is simpler (less complex) than the numeric figure “4”. The Walker reference, however, demonstrates no conception, much less a disclosure, of the utilization of the complexity of a single character (letter, number, etc.) as the basis for the determination of the portion of the display area of the display screen to be segregated from the remainder thereof by a “visual confirmation guide” as herein disclosed and claimed. In other words, Applicants respectfully submit that Walker is not in any way concerned with the complexity of the individual respective characters (e.g., “I” and “w”) utilized in the formation of a word or words, but rather simply utilizes a count of the characters utilized in the formation of a word or group of words as the determinant of complexity in his disclosure (i.e., complexity in Walker is determined based upon the length of the combination of characters required to form the word or group of words to be set off with regard to the remainder of the display, not the complexity of the individual characters that make up that word or group of words).

In addition and similarly to the above, Applicants respectfully note that the present application also specifically discloses, and now specifically claims, that the remark control means also may operate based upon the **frequency of a character being displayed**. Applicants respectfully submit that this also is different from the Walker reference as is shown by the example thereof discussed at Column 39, lines 50-53 of the Walker reference and relied upon by the Examiner.

Specifically, in the Walker example certain words are selected for so-called “temporal protrusion”, a concept that encompasses the display of the words appearing before, after, or both before and after specified words on the display screen. In addition, the Walker examples indicate that a selection may be made based upon the frequency with which the selected words appear in the document. Further, the operation of the remark display control means of the present invention does not provide the so-called “temporal protrusion” of the Walker example relied upon by the Examiner wherein words appearing with low frequency are displayed for a longer period than the words surrounding them.

Hence, Applicants respectfully submit that it is clear that the utilization of the frequency of occurrence of a character as a determinant of a portion to be set off from the remainder of a display screen cannot be fairly derived from the Walker disclosure. Walker instead merely discloses the determinant of the frequency of occurrence of a word without consideration of the frequency of the occurrence of the character that may be contained in that word for purposes of determining what portions of the display screen should be set off from the remainder thereof.

For example, Applicants respectfully call the attention of the Examiner to the situation wherein a passage in the Japanese language is displayed on the display screen. The written Japanese language has no rule concerning the leaving of a space between words as does the English language. Hence, the Walker control based upon the frequency of the occurrence of particular words cannot be applied to the control of a displayed passage in the Japanese language because to do so would require a complex syntax analysis totally beyond the scope, content and/or contemplation of the Walker disclosure.

Therefore, since by the foregoing Amendment Applicants have proposed that all of the claims remaining under active prosecution in this application be amended so as to require that the remark control means is to operate based upon the **complexity of a character being displayed**, and/or the **frequency of a character being displayed**, Applicants respectfully submit that the present invention as now claimed is not anticipated under 35 USC 102 by the Walker reference currently relied upon by the Examiner.

Reconsideration and a decision withdrawing the currently outstanding rejection of the present application under 35 USC 102 in view of the foregoing Amendment and Remarks in response to this submission, therefore, is respectfully requested. Further, in view of the foregoing Amendment and Remarks, Applicants respectfully submit that all of the currently outstanding rejections against the claims of this application as they will stand upon the entry of the foregoing Amendment have been overcome. Hence, Applicants respectfully submit that this application is now in condition for allowance and respectfully request a decision so holding in response to this submission.

Applicants believe that additional fees are not required in connection with the consideration of this response to the currently outstanding Official Action. However, if for any reason a fee is required, a fee paid is inadequate or credit is owed for any excess fee paid, you are hereby authorized and requested to charge and/or credit Deposit Account No. **04-1105**, as necessary, for the correct payment of all fees which may be due in connection with the filing and consideration of this communication.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: October 8, 2008

By: 

Steven M. Jensen (Reg. No. 42,693)  
For David A. Tucker (Reg. No. 27,840)

Customer No. 21874

EDWARDS ANGELL PALMER & DODGE, LLP  
P.O. Box 55874  
Boston, Massachusetts 02205  
(617) 517-5508